DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 153 913 SO 010 856

AUTHOR Rist, Ray C.
TITLE On the Education of Gastarbeiter Children in Germany: A Comparative Study of Policies and Programs in Bavaria and Berlin.
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 58p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Toronto, Ontario, March 27-31, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Failure; Affirmative Action; Biculturalism; Bilingual Education; *Comparative Education; Cultural Disadvantagement; Cultural Pluralism; Curriculum Design; Dropout Problems; Educational Change; Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Needs; Educational Philosophy; *Educational Policy; Educational Practice; *Educational Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Foreign Students; Foreign Workers; *Immigrants; Migrant Children; Minority Group Children; Models; Parent School Relationship; *School Integration; *School Segregation; Second Language Learning; Social Change; Socialization; Supplementary Education; Transitional Classes
IDENTIFIERS West Germany; West Germany (Bavaria)

ABSTRACT

This paper examines two programs for the education of immigrant (gastarbeiter) children in Germany. The Bavarian model bases its program upon the assumption that most foreign children remain in Germany for only a short time, eventually returning to their native countries. Evidence largely discredits this assumption, however. Though providing options for those foreign children who speak German, its primary emphasis is upon maintaining skills in the mother tongue. Immigrant children are given their own schools and are encouraged to stay there. By establishing this type of system, Bavaria is perpetuating the isolation and segregation of its minority population. Conversely, the Berlin (West) model is aimed at the integration of the children of the foreign worker as quickly as possible into the German language classroom. In contrast to the Bavarian program, the Berlin model tends to overemphasize integration. Cultural integration is so strong that no recognition of the national background of students is tolerated. Consequently, the foreign student dropout rate is quite high. Both approaches can be challenged on their basic assumptions and educational practices since neither acknowledges the multicultural nature of German society. (Author/JK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

APR 24 1978

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EA
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

ED153913

ON THE EDUCATION OF GUESTWORKER CHILDREN IN GERMANY: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF POLICIES AND PROGRAMS IN BAVARIA AND BERLIN*

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ray C. Rist
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Toronto, Ontario, March 27-31, 1978)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Ray C. Rist, Ph.D.

Visiting Professor
College of Human Ecology
A Statutory College of the State University
Community Service Education
Cornell University

SP 010 856

SESSION 9.20

* The data reported here were gathered during the 1976-1977 academic year while the author served as the Senior American Fulbright Fellow at the Max Planck Institut für Bildungsforschung in Berlin (West).

ON THE EDUCATION OF GUESTWORKER CHILDREN IN GERMANY:
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF POLICIES AND PROGRAMS IN BAVARIA AND BERLIN

Despite protestations to the contrary, the Federal Republic of Germany has become a country of immigration, not merely a transient stop for guestworkers.

An important outcome of this immigration of millions of guestworkers and their dependents is that Germany is evolving into a culturally and ethnically pluralistic society. These new immigrants, the Turkish-Germans, Greek-Germans, Yugoslav-Germans, have found a home in Germany. They are strengthening their resolve to stay by reuniting their families, investing more of their income on their "quality of life" within Germany, drastically reducing their remittances to the home country, and by actively seeking the education of their children in German schools (cf. Rist, 1978, forthcoming).

Table 1 indicates the flow of foreign workers into the Federal Republic from the year 1960. These data include only an estimate of those workers who came into the country under EEC agreements after July 1, 1968. As EEC workers are free to come and go as they wish, it has been extremely difficult to

ascertain their exact numbers. Several estimates have placed it, as of 1974, at approximately 560,000. Furthermore, these data do not include dependents, nor do they include illegal immigrants. Diamant (1970: 50) estimated that the number of illegal workers could be as high as fifteen percent of the number legally in the country. That estimate, if correct, would suggest an additional 290,000 migrant workers in Germany in 1976.[1] The total is approximately 2,250,000 guestworkers, or between twelve and thirteen percent of the entire labor force in the Federal Republic in 1976.

TABLE 1 HERE

In the early years of the immigration, few dependents accompanied guestworkers into Germany. In 1965, there were 1,216,804 guestworkers, but only 23,907 dependent children and youth under age eighteen (Mahler, 1976:181). By 1976, however, there were 1,932,600 guestworkers and 836,000 dependent children and youth (Akpinar, Lopez-Blasco, Vink, 1977:17). While most of these children and youth have come from the mother country to join their parents, a significant number have been born in Germany. In 1976, 17% of all live births in the Federal Republic were to guestworker families (Statistiches Bundesamt, 1976:97). (Without these 108,000 births, Germany would have experienced an absolute population decline.) In Frankfurt and Berlin one of two and one of three births respectively are to guestworker families.

---

[1] The Annual Labor Report, prepared by the United States Department of State, on labor and economic conditions in the Federal Republic of Germany places the number of illegal workers for 1975 at approximately 200,000 (U.S. Department of State, 1976:56).

TABLE 1

The Immigrant Worker Population in the Federal Republic of Germany, 1960-1976

Year	Employed immigrant workers at the end of September	Comparison as to the previous year absolute	/ percentage	Percentage of all workers
1960	329,356	+162,527	+97.4	1.5
1961	548,916	+219,560	+66.7	2.5
1962	711,459	+162,543	+29.6	3.2
1963	828,743	+117,284	+16.5	3.7
1964	985,616	+156,873	+18.9	4.4
1965	1,216,804	+231,188	+23.5	5.7
1966	1,313,491	+ 96,687	+ 7.9	6.1
1967	991,255	-322,236	-24.5	4.7
1968	1,089,873	+ 98,618	+ 9.9	5.2
1969	1,501,409	+411,536	+37.8	7.0
1970	1,948,951	+447,542	+29.8	9.0
1971	2,240,793	+291,842	+15.0	10.3
1972	2,352,292	+222,599	+ 5.0	10.8
1973	2,595,000	+242,608	+10.3	11.9
1974	2,350,000	-245,000	- 9.4	11.2
1975	2,171,000	-179,000	- 7.6	10.5
1976	1,932,600	-238,400	-10.9	9.7

SOURCES: H. Müller. Ausländische Arbeiter in unserer Gesellschaft. Munich: Kösel, 1975; OECD, 1976; and The Federal Ministry for Labor and Social Affairs, Bonn, 1976.

Naturally, the growth in guestworker children has had a considerable impact upon the German educational system. Throughout Germany, the schools, which have had a largely homogeneous population, now enroll tens of thousands of Turkish, Greek, Italian, Yugoslav, Spanish, and Portugese students. Not only their presence, but their sheer numbers have necessitated changes in the policies and programs of German education.

This paper will focus upon the Länder of Bavaria and Berlin as opposite ends of the spectrum of educational policies evolved for the guestworker children.

I.

Educational Policies for Guestworker Children: The Bavarian Model

Since 1973, Bavaria has implemented a "model experiment" in the education of guestworker children (Harant, 1976:159). What has been termed an "experiment" has, in fact, been simply an administrative decision by the Bavarian State Ministry for Instruction and Culture that one approach would be used in Bavaria for the education of the foreign worker children. While publications by the Ministry continue to tout the "Bavarian Open Model" as successful and worthy of emulation by the other Länder in Germany (Mahler, 1976a:1), no empirical evidence is available to support the claim (cf. Mahler, 1976a; 1976b; Deutscher Carvitasverband, 1975).

Bavaria is, in reality, basing its educational practice on economic and political considerations. The Bavarian view is to stress the foreign workers' short term presence and lack of commitment to German society (Mahler, 1976b:16; Bavarian Ministry for Instruction and Culture, 1974:20, 1975). As Mahler, who has served as one of the chief architects of this approach, has noted (1974:16):

> The question is, however, whether these families and their children will stay in Bavaria until 1980 and later... The responsible authorities of the Federal government and of the various states expect foreign workers to stay in the Federal Republic of Germany for only a short time. Thus the integration of foreign "fellow citizens" into the Federal Republic--a theme which has been proclaimed for years--has taken place within the most narrow bounds.

Although Bavaria has based its educational program upon the "rotation principle" of foreign labor in Germany, the evidence overwhelmingly discredits the notion that workers "rotate" out of the country on a regular, short-term basis (Harant, 1976:165; Minzlaff, 1976:17). Indeed, there is a growing number of family reunions in Germany, a decline in foreign workers leaving the country, a high number of births among the foreign worker communities, and the integration of foreign workers into the economy; and there is also the voice of policy makers at the Federal level. As Bodenbender (1976:13), an official within the Federal Ministry for Labor and Social Affairs, has commented, "The Federal Republic

of Germany rejects the principle of the rotation of foreign workers as the basis upon which our manpower needs are to be resolved."

The Educational Program

The Bavarian State Ministry for Instruction and Culture maintains that an educational approach which stresses the integration of foreign worker children into German society has generally failed. In 1974, the Ministry stated (1974:20):

> In casting a retrospective glance, one can easily recognize that the heretofore existing arrangements concerning the education of the guestworker children were aimed at the philosophical and practical integration of these children into the German school system and also into German society. However, the fallacy in these arrangements has been that it was assumed that these children could integrate into the German schools with a minimum of difficulty. Those who had anticipated that the foreign children would be able to learn the German language in a rapid way have now had to admit that this could not be achieved.

From this view, the Ministry concluded that a quite different approach to the education of the children had to be undertaken, namely, the "Open Model." This is a pedagogical program, states the Ministry (1974:20):

> ...which proceeds from the actual educational needs of the children. In recognition of these needs, it is imperative that the only reason for their school education not be considered their future integration into German society. Rather, various measures have to be intiated which enable foreign children to both integrate into the German school system (where German is the language of instruction) and also to return home and join the school system of their native country (where instruction would be given in the mother tongue).

The foundation of the program is thus theoretically grounded in the view that the foreign worker children must be supported in an educational environment which encourages bilingualism. On this point the Ministry is to be commended, for it is precisely such an environment that has been called for by many international organizations concerned with foreign workers and their children (cf. Council of Europe, 1974:89; European Economic Community, 1976: Article 3). The shortcoming, however, is that the Bavarian approach has used this orientation to rationalize the isolation and segregation of the foreign children. Under the guise of bilingualism, a system is maintained that is simultaneously supposed to prepare children for German classes in Munich and Turkish classes in rural Anatolia. But the end result, as a number of critics have noted, is close to functional illiteracy in both languages (Friberg and Hohmann, 1976:11-25; Deutscher Caritaverband, 1975; and Harant, 1976:164).

Officially, the following principles guide the development of the program (Bavarian State Ministry for Instruction and Culture; 1974:20):

1) Foreign Children who are already living in Germany and whose families wish to remain here should be integrated into the German school system, provided that the parents so desire it and that the children have a sufficient command of the German language.
2) The interests of those parents and children who will be in the Federal Republic for only a short time must be considered as well. If they desire to maintain their ties to their native country and especially with the native school system, their children have the right to be educated in such a way that they will be able to continue their education in the home country.
3) Children who do not speak German sufficiently to function in German classes are to be taught in their mother tongue.
4) Children who have sufficiently mastered the German language may remain in the mother tongue class or switch to the German classes, according to the wishes of their parents.

Based on these principles, the guestworker children are generally provided three alternative classroom situations.[2] First, in the standard German language classroom along with native

---

[2] As might be anticipated, there are clear exceptions to this statement. The most self evident example is that in Bavaria, 7,673 Greek students were during the 1976-1977 academic year in private schools sponsored by the Greek General Consulate (Bavarian State Ministry for Instruction and Culture, 1977:2,5).

Bavarian children are those immigrant children who have sufficient skill in the German language to receive their instruction in German. Approximately 1/6 (6,246 of 37,442) of all foreign worker children in Bavaria are in such classes. Parents must request this placement. These children are given eight lessons per week in their mother tongue if there are at least 15 students with the same mother tongue in the school. If there are fewer, there is no mother tongue instruction. The Ministry has stated that these eight lessons are in lieu of other scheduled classes; however, Harant (1976:161) counters that these courses constitute an "over-load" of additional classroom work.

When criticisms are raised about segregative components of the educational program for foreign children, the Bavarian Ministry points to these children in standard German classrooms as proof that foreign workers and their children have the option of either integrating into the society or maintaining closer homeland ties. Data from the Ministry, however, shows a decline of students in such classes in one year: in 1975-1976, there were 6,502 students among 300 classrooms, but in 1976-1977 there were only 6,246 students in 326 different classes. (during this same period, the total number of foreign worker students in the state grew by more than 4,000.)

The second classroom arrangement for guestworker children is unique to the Bavarian approach. Children who have not learned enough of the language to receive their instruction in German are grouped together in classes of at least 25 to receive all their school instruction in the mother tongue. If any parents

desire only mother tongue instruction, their children would remain in these classes regardless of German language proficiency.

The mother tongue instruction is provided by teachers from the home country. (During the 1976-1977 academic year there were 403 foreign teachers working in the Bavarian public school system. There were an additional 141 teachers in the private Greek school system.) In these classrooms German is required to be taught as the first foreign language, up to eight periods per week. The theoretical goal of these classes is to provide a transition period for the foreign child to progress to a level of proficiency whereby he/she can choose to continue in the mother tongue classroom or move to a German language classroom.

From these classes the Bavarian Ministry has concluded (cf. Mahler, 1976b:16) that:

> ...the foreign child cannot learn German and simultaneously improve his knowledge in those other aspects of the curriculum when the instruction is in German... Only after the pupil has learned the subject matters by means of his mother tongue, and German has been taught sufficiently as a foreign language, should one suggest sending the child into a class where all subjects are taught in the German language.

Data from the State Ministry for Instruction and Culture indicates that this option of mother tongue instruction has been rapidly expanding (1976b: 1977). Whereas in 1975-1976 there were 8,623 students distributed among 255 classes, one academic year later there were 10,457 students in 318 classes. During

the same period, the number of foreign teachers teaching in mother tongue classrooms increased from 231 to 297. Thus in the same period, classes in which German was the primary language of instruction lost nearly 300 students while classes which were taught primarily in the mother tongue gained almost 2,000.

The third classroom arrangement for the immigrant children is put into effect when there are too few to warrant mother tongue classes. This third option has two alternatives: when there are too few students of any one mother tongue to build individual mother tongue classes, students of different nationalities are grouped into "transition" classes of at least 25 students per class; when there are at least 12 foreign worker children in a school, the policy is to offer eight supplementary German lessons per week for them. If there are less than 12 guestworker children in a school, no provisions are made.[2]

The Bavarian Approach: A Critique

An analysis of the Bavarian approach can be made from three perspectives. First, one can focus on the philosophy of the program, second, the policies that operationalize it, and finally the actual programs as they have been instituted in Bavarian schools.

Philosophy: Philosophically, the Bavarian approach rests on the rotation model as an accurate reflection of the relationship of

---

[2] In the data on the 1976-1977 school year provided by the Ministry, approximately 17,000 of the 33,200 guestworker children in the Bavarian public schools were participating in one of the three options. How many of the remaining 16,200 were in schools with such small enrollments that no program existed, or how many functioned well with German and sought no mother tongue instruction is not indicated.

foreign workers to the German labor market, even though this assumption has been strongly discredited. The position of Greek workers in Germany and the German economy is given as the basis for the rotation model. As Mahler (1976b:17), a Ministry official, has stated:

> The programs we have developed are in accordance with the wishes of the sending countries, especially those of Greece and Yugoslavia. These governments as a matter of course, anticipate the return home of their foreign workers.[4]

The Bavarian model may have a legitimacy if, in fact, workers and their families will return to the home country in a year or two. However, all the evidence since the 1973 ban on further immigration of foreign workers show that workers are, on the whole, staying in Germany. Thus there seems to be little reason to prepare children for school systems which the overwhelming majority will never enter.

There seems to be even less justification when one considers that compulsory education in the home-country may be but five years.

---

[4] The Ministry bases its policies on the presence of Greek and Yugoslavian children in the Bavarian schools. However, 56% of the Greek children residing in Bavaria are not even in the Bavarian public schools. Of 7,673 Greek children, 4,283 are in the private "national schools" offered by the Greek consulate. Only 11% of foreign worker children in the public schools are Greek. Second, the total number of Yugoslavian children in the public schools during the 1976-1977 school year was 4,817, or only 13% of the total foreign student enrollment. Together the Greek and Yugoslavian students make up only 24% of the foreign student population. Turkish children comprise one-half of all foreign worker children in the Bavarian public schools--16,549 of a total of 33,159.

The Bavarian approach emphasizes the marginality and continued non-integration of the foreign workers and their families within Bavaria and in so doing avoids any serious efforts to prepare for the long-term presence of thousands of foreign children in the schools.

Policies: The first of the policies of the Bavarian approach is to provide instruction in the mother tongue, a recommendation which finds support from the Standing Conference of European Ministers of Education, Council of Europe, (1974b:43-44):

> The Conference recommends that the governments of the member states be invited to provide opportunities for migrants' children to learn, keep up and develop a good knowledge of their mother tongue and the culture of their country of origin so that they can both settle down well in the educational system of the host country and keep the door open for a return to their country of origin, while taking advantage, if they desire, of their bilingual situation.

Within the Federal Republic of Germany, a similar recommendation has been made by the Conference of Ministers (1976a:3, 8):

> The aim of the schools within the Federal Republic is to enable foreign children to learn German and to succeed in passing their final examinations at German schools. Besides, they are to acquire proficiency in their mother tongue and to develop this proficiency.

> Foreign children who cannot follo. the lessons in a German class because of their linguistic difficulties are to be enrolled in preparatory classes where the first language of instruction will be the mother tongue. These classes are to ease for the foreign students the transition and integration into German schools.

As suggested earlier, the Bavarian approach has significantly modified the recommendations as listed above. The German Conference of Ministers of Culture and Education recommends that schools enable foreign children to develop a "proficiency" in their mother tongue, but the emphasis is on learning and passing school examinations in German. The Bavarian approach inverts this recommendation, placing primary emphasis upon maintaining skills in the mother tongue so as to enable the foreign children to return to the school system of the mother country. Further,--and especially for those children who receive all their school instruction only in their mother tongue,--it becomes unlikely if not impossible that they will ever be able to learn German well enough to "pass their final examinations at German schools." It is this approach which Bavaria recommends to the rest of Germany as the most appropriate for the education of the foreign worker children.

Harant (1976:163) challenges the assumption inherent in the Bavarian policies that education is only possible within one language thought structure at a time. He notes that the assumption of a unilingual thought structure is challenged by the experiences of many European countries where bilingual and even multilingual instruction of the children occurs with seemingly no deterents

to their learning. Rather than assuming that children are incapable of learning with multiple linguistic structures, he argues that such learning occurs for many children and adults alike throughout the world, and that it is a strength to be encouraged.

Central to the Bavarian approach is the discretion of parents to choose instruction of their children either in the mother tongue or in German language classes. Bavarian officials cite data on the growth of mother tongue classes as evidence of the interest of parents in sustaining the linguistic and educational ties to the home country. As the Ministry noted in a 1974 report (1974:21):

> Foreign pupils and their parents are eagerly making use of the mother tongue classes when they are offered. In fact, when such classes are instituted, the most difficult task is locating sufficient classrooms to meet the demand.

What is to be made of this support by parents for the mother tongue classes? Is it, in fact, a reflection of the parents' interest in maintaining an active and ongoing link for the children to the school systems in the home countries? The Bavarian authorities say yes, for if parents wanted to stay in Germany, they would choose German language classes. That the mother tongue classes are chosen is an indication, say Bavarian officials, that the wishes of the workers are being met.

There are, however, several alternative explanations. First, to parallel the early experiences of American immigrants, these new immigrants may wish to remain in Germany, but not at the expense of shedding their cultural identities. Just as the Irish, Italian, Japanese, Polish, and other racial/ethnic groups who

came to America sought to maintain their cultural links through parochial schools, mother tongue newspapers, and social activities, so also perhaps the new immigrants into Germany are using mother tongue classes in the public schools in much the same manner. (For the Greek community, however, the desire for more autonomy and control over the schooling process has led to the formation of Greek national schools which enroll more than 4,000 Greek children in Bavaria.)

A second explanation is that the parents have chosen mother tongue lessons because they are unsure of their own status in Bavaria and how long they will be able to remain as "guests." The continual emphasis by Bavarian officials that the workers are in the Land on a short-term, rotating basis may well create a feeling of impermanance in the guestworker communities. In this light, the choice of the mother tongue classes becomes a hedge for their children against the possibility of rotation out of the country.

Yet a third explanation, as posited by Harant (1976:165), is that the social and cultural strains experienced by the parents in coming to Germany have been severe enough that they have begun to idealize the mother country. Thus, in the midst of their isolation, exploitation, marginality, and general insecurity, the parents believe that it would be better for the children to be able to return to the mother country where none of the ills that afflict them in Germany would be present.

Finally, one could posit that the guestworkers have a realistic assessment of the actual educational opportunities for their

children within German schools, Rather than putting their children on a tread mill that would take the children nowhere, for the German educational system is so rigged against them that the options for success are nearly nil, it may be better to give them the mother tongue and a stronger sense of the cultural identity of their mother country, even if they were born in Germany.[5] In this light, choosing mother tongue classes is essentially an act of resignation and protection to shield their children from the fierce competition, the near certain lack of success, and the cultural isolation they would experience in the German language school.

A third component of the policies of the Bavarian approach is the development of parallel curricular tracks for children in mother tongue classes. Students in these classes are, in theory, able to move along in their academic instruction in the mother tongue at a pace equivalent to that in the German language classes. Thus it is assumed that when the children have mastered German, they will be able to switch from the mother tongue into German language classes without a loss in grade standing. It is ludicrous to assume that using home country curriculum materials which portray the historical, social, cultural, and economic life of the sending country prepares the children for German classrooms or German life and society. Nor will eight hours per week of German prepare students for moving into German language classes and functioning on a par in content and curriculum with German age mates.

---

[5] Data released by the Conference of Ministers of Education and Culture indicate that in the 1975/1976 academic year there were a total of 196 Greek, 298 Italian, 91 Spanish, 218 Turkish, and 256 Portugese students in all Gymnasiums in the Land of Bavaria. These figures combined represented 0.004% of all Gymnasium students in the Land. (Conference of Ministers of Education and Federal Ministry for Education and Science, 1976:32).

The policy actually works to the opposite ends of the public pronouncements about its goals. Rather than facilitating the movement of the immigrant children into the German language classes, the policy ensures that the longer the students stay with the mother tongue instruction, the greater the probability of them not being able to make the transfer.[6] In short, the mother tongue approach not only segregates and isolates immigrant children from the German children, it also goes far to ensure their educational failure. [See the Deutchen Caritaverbandes (1975), the analyses by Harant (1976), Minzlaff (1975), and Friberg and Hohmann (1976).]

Programs: Options for Failure

Having examined both the philsophical background and policy approaches which have been taken by the Bavarian government regarding the instruction of the immigrant children, it is now possible to assess the three classroom options developed for the education of the children.

Option 1: Placing the foreign children in standard classes where German is spoken and teaching them their own mother tongue for up to eight hours a week, is a feasible one for those students who come to the school with a sufficient knowledge of German to meet classroom demands. However, for those students who are not totally fluent and need extra help, no provisions are made for additional

---

[6] The same outcome was found in a similar program initiated at one school in Frankfurt. As a result, the School Inspector for Foreign Children in the city of Frankfurt has begun an effort to dismantle the program and return the foreign worker children to multilingual preparatory classes. (Cf. Frankfurter Rundschau, "Foreign Children in Frankfurt Too Long in Seprarate Classes." January 3, 1977.)

instruction in German. The children are instead taught their respective mother tongue languages.

The lack of additional help becomes even more critical when one considers that in the German school system, the school day is typically only three or four hours long. Parents are expected to supplement the classroom instruction with several hours of tutoring each day at home. Guestworker parents, who themselves may have had only five years of formal schooling and who may speak little German, are hardly adequate tutors for their children. The handicap of guestworker children in relation to their German peers is thus intensified.

One inadequacy of this approach is that the foreign language students are frequently unable to successfully complete the requirements of the German schools. The time taken away from course work for learning the mother tongue and the lack of additional assistance for those who would have difficulties learning German mean that the opportunities for success are severely limited. While it is important for those children who want it to have mother tongue instruction, it is also important to note that the time used for such instruction is time taken away from the class material on which examinations are based, and on which entrance into the stratified secondary level is determined. No marks are given in favor of the student who has had Turkish or Serbo Croation when at the end of the fourth grade the decisions are made on which students shall have access to the Gymnasium curriculum. The mother tongue instruction, instead of being an integrated part of the education plan for the immigrant child, is set apart--an extra requirement that is not expected of German students and that takes away instruction time from the rest of the curriculum.

To make matters worse, eight hours per week of instruction in the mother tongue is hardly sufficient to enable the child to return to the home country and readily resume his education there. He receives insufficient educational preparation for either staying in Germany or going to the homeland of his parents. Grossmann had foreseen such consequences even before the Bavarian plan was put into operation (1972:145):

> The controversial discussion about the extent to which foreign worker children are to be integrated as well as the extent to which they are to remain connected to their native countries results in programs where the children feel nowhere at home. They become illiterates in two languages. For after all, the educational programs frequently developed for foreign children are no more than simply adding together the German and the foreign programs.

Option 2: Here is the most unique component of the Bavarian approach: all classroom instruction is carried on in the mother tongue with German offered as a foreign language. This option is based upon a belief that a linguistic handicap is the main deterrent to a successful education in the German language schools.

This option presupposes that (a) the student will receive adequate coverage of subject matters in the mother tongue using materials from the home country, and (b) the student will master German in the mother tongue classes on only eight hours of instruction per week. As discussed already, neither of these assumptions

seems likely to accomplish the task of allowing a successful crossover to German language classes.

It would be helpful if there were any research evidence whatsoever to substantiate that the assumptions are based in fact. Are the curricular materials comparable between classes held in the mother tongue and the standard German classroom? Are the mother tongue classes keeping pace in covering instructional material? Are the "German as a second language" classes succeeding? The total absence of such data suggests that, in the end, data is irrelevant to the program for it is being carried out for reasons that make research irrelevant.

Finally, even if the child is brought to a mastery of the German language, and even if the mother tongue instruction has kept pace with that received in the German language classroom, the child can continue indefinitely in the mother tongue classroom. When the theoretical point has been reached of an unhindered crossover from mother tongue to German, the Bavarian approach states the child does not have to go.[7] Nowhere does the Ministry make clear just how far the student could go in the mother tongue and still stay on a par with his German peers. If, in fact, an

---

[7] What would be most interesting both from a research and a policy view would be to undertake a close-in ethnographic study of the manner in which parents make the decision on whether or not to push for the crossover of their children from mother tongue instruction to German language instruction. When are the parents consulted by school officials? How are the options presented to them? What are the reasons that parents choose one option as opposed to the other? Do their reasons justify the rotation model? Answers to questions such as these would be important insights on how the foreign worker parents view Bavarian education and the role (or lack thereof) for their own children.

immigrant student could complete his education in the mother tongue and remain on a par, Bavaria would have accomplished a unique achievement--the creation of a totally "separate but equal" school system.

Here the crux of the matter is reached. By establishing the system it has, Bavaria has created the means for perpetuating the isolation and segregation of its minority population. Under the guise of providing options, what instead is occurring is the systematic short changing of the immigrant children. By not wanting to hold the immigrant children to the standards or expectations held for the German children, the policies and programs will ensure that the former become no threat to the latter. Rather, the immigrant children are given their own schools and instruction in the mother tongue and are encouraged to stay where they are. The number of students in mother tongue classes goes up. Their sense of dislocation and separation from German society will grow rather than diminish. Their contact with German peers will be virtually nil, and they will wonder where they belong. Critics of the Bavarian approach have argued the program is producing a "lost generation."[8]

---

8 The third and final option, that of what is done where the critical mass of foreign worker students within German language schools is too small to provide mother tongue instruction bears little mention. The fact that it flies in the face of all the pedagogical principles underlying the rationale for Option Two has already been noted. At best, the notion of bringing immigrant children together, regardless of mother tongue backgrounds, and giving additional German lessons is a make shift response to an unfortunate situation. Interestingly, though it is only a "stop gap" measure, it is the closest any of the three options come to actually endorsing an assimilationist approach to the education of the immigrant children.

II.

Educational Policies for Guestworker Children: The Berlin (West) Model

Where the Bavarian approach assumes the eventual rotation of guestworkers out of Germany, the Berlin position is unreservedly aimed at the integration of the foreign worker children as quickly as is pedagogically possible into the German language classrooms.

Jancke, a Berlin educational official, offers two reasons for the rejection of the rotation principle (1976a). First is that foreign children are tending to stay in Germany for longer periods, making their reintegration into the schools of their mother country exceedingly problematic, as compulsory education in those countries is generally no more than five years. Second, is the more general proposition that it is simply not realistic to assume that guestworkers who are remaining in Germany, bringing their families for reunions, and wanting their children to attend German schools are going to return to their homelands any time soon. Jancke cites 1972 data from the Federal Labor Office which shows that even prior to the immigration restrictions of 1973, a full third of all foreign workers who were in Germany with their families and had at least one child indicated that they intended to remain permanently in Germany. When there were three children in the family the percentage wanting to remain jumped to 44 percent. In light of such aspirations of the workers to remain in Germany (along with the evidence confirming that they are staying), there

is no realistic alternative but to integrate the children into the German educational system.

Jancke argues that the integration of the foreign worker children into the German schools will have positive social effects that will ripple far beyond the confines of the classrooms. He notes (1976a:325-6):

> The creation of integrated educational settings in our schools, that is the teaching of foreign and German children in the same class with German as the language of instruction, has to be our main aim. This is so because instruction in German hastens the integration of the foreigners into German society. School integration is a necessary precondition to enable foreign students to receive the same education as German students, to be sufficiently trained to pass the examinations, and to have the possibilities for a professional education. The success of school integration will directly influence whether and how much the younger generation succeeds in securing the same civil rights as we Germans now have. Besides, the integration of the foreign pupils will sooner or later favorably decrease the present ghetto-like situations in the foreign worker housing areas.

A 1971 policy statement from the Berlin Senate Office for Education (entitled "Ausführungsvorschriften über den Unterricht für Kinder ausländischer Arbeitnehmer und für jugendliche

ausländische Arbeitnehmer") provides the following directives, all with the aim of enhancing the integration of the foreign worker children (Berlin Senator für Schulwesen, 1971:51):

1. The foreign worker pupil is to be placed in a standard German language classroom commensurate to his age and pedagogical development. During the early period of his attendance, he is excused from selected curricula material so as to receive intensive German language instruction. Such special instructions are to continue until the pupil is absolutely able to participate in the instruction and activities of his class.
2. Where sufficient numbers of such elementary school pupils are available, special preparatory classes [Vorbereitungsklassen] will be instigated with no more than 20 students per class. It is the aim of these classes to serve as a transition period into the German language classes, with the time necessary for such a transition to be no more than eighteen months.
3. For those foreign students in the secondary schools, two levels of special instruction are to be offered. For those who are newly arrived, beginner classes [Anfangsgruppen] will instruct in rudimentary German while the advanced classes [Fortgeschrittgruppen] will be prepared for transition into the German language classrooms.
4. The percentage of foreign pupils in any standard German classroom shall not exceed 20 percent as any

number above this percentage hinders and forestalls successful integration.

5. For those areas where the percentage of foreign worker children is sufficient that they cannot all be accommodated within standard German language classes and still maintain the 20 percent ceiling, special classes [Besondere Ausländerklassen] will be intitiated where all instruction shall be in German and the curriculum shall be that of the standard German classroom. These classes are offered to insure that foreign students have access to the same curriculum and pedagogical instruction as is available to German Students.

The aim is to integrate foreign students as quickly as possible, but unfortunately the 20% ceiling often hinders integration (cf. Jancke, 1976b). Of the 13,064 foreign worker students in the elementary grades during the 1976-1977 academic year, 2,933 were in the transition classes and 1,577 were in the special German language classes where all their classmates were also foreign. At the secondary vocational school level, nearly 50 percent of the guest-worker students are outside an integrated school setting (1,485 of the 3,254 foreign students were in either beginner, advanced or special classes.) In the aggregate 63.7 percent of all foreign worker students were in integrated school settings (cf. Berlin Senator für Schulwesen, 1976:18, 22 and 26).

Nearly 2,000 more foreign students could participate in integrated classrooms were the allowable percentage of foreign

students raised above 20 percent. By retaining the figure of no more than one-fifth of a class being foreign students, the school authorities have created a large pool of foreign students with essentially nowhere to go. The 20% policy has necessitated that the schools improvise with segregated, all-foreign student classes where German is the language of instruction.

The policy options widely used in the United States to avoid exactly this outcome (cf. Rist:1976, 1978) have been rejected by the school authorities in Berlin. They could maintain the 20 percent quota with maximum integration between foreign worker and German students by using either of two techniques: a pupil transportation program or shifted school boundaries. Busing students to schools with a low number of foreign students was rejected by the school officials on the basis of their interpretation of such programs in England and the United States. As Jancke (1976a:331) notes in this regard:

> The Berlin Senate does not believe in solving the problem with experiments like the so-called "busing programs" which have been and are still being carried out in England and the United States. The reports from these experiments show that the transportation of students for their daily class instruction to an area in other than that where the family lives does not even produce the illusion of integration [Scheinintegration]. New social relations among the students are not realized for they have no way to continue them in the private spheres of their home and neighborhood. The isolation of these

> groups from one another becomes even more obvious to them when it is only the bus which brings them together. Instead of the achievement of integration, what is achieved is a worsening of aggressive behavior as can be seen by situations in the United States and England.

Alternatively, the school authorities could also increase the number of foreign students in integrated classrooms by redesignating school district boundaries. By creating new attendance zones, it would be possible to decrease the concentrations of foreign students and enhance their dispersal into other school settings. This option has also been rejected by the school officials on the grounds that the overcrowded districts are so close to one another that new formations would bring no relief. Those districts where there are few foreign students are so far from areas where foreign students are concentrated that they could not be reached without resorting to transportation programs.

Excluding these two policy options, the school authorities have had to create the special classes, segregated and comprised solely of foreign students, with the hope that the solution to over-concentration of the foreign students will be resolved by non-educational processes. Jancke (1976a:332) argues that housing policies will bring about residential dispersal of foreign workers and their families thus alleviating the school concentrations. The impact of housing policies will be felt in two ways: first, by prohibiting the further in-migration of workers into designated

areas of over-concentration, and second, by dispersing to other districts persons presently in these areas as housing is demolished and only gradually rebuilt. To rely on the housing situation of the foreign worker communities to relieve high concentrations of foreign worker children in the schools is to opt for very slow rates of change. Special segregated schools are thus likely to exist well into the future.

Integration and National Identity:

In comparison with the Bavarian Program where policies pursued by school officials have isolated foreign students and denied them participation in German schools, Berlin officials have been accused of the other extreme--emphasizing integration to such a degree that what is sought is a "Germanization" of the foreign students (cf. Ferber and Mueller, 1977). The critics have traced this emphasis on the creation of a "German identity" to the very beginnings of the school experience for the foreign children. Their studies of kindergarten classes in the Kreuzberg district have led them to conclude that the emphasis upon cultural integration was so strong that no recognition or legitimation of the national background of students was tolerated.

School officials, however, deny that they are seeking to "Germanize" foreign pupils. They claim that their intent is misunderstood and that there are no comparisons with earlier efforts at cultural integration which characterized, for example, the treatment of Polish speaking coal miners and their families who immigrated into the Ruhr area in the early 1900's. Jancke (1976a:329) states that the Berlin program complies with the

December, 1971, resolution passed by the German Ministers of Education which reaffirmed the right of foreign students to learn the language and culture of their mother country. In principle, all Länder affirmed that there should be voluntary "supplementary instruction" in the mother tongue and the cultural knowledge and history of the native country. The Ministers left to the discretion of each of the eleven Länder precisely how such cultural and linguistic preservation would be implemented.

Berlin has chosen to entrust all such supplementary instruction to the consulates and embassies of the countries who have foreign workers in the city. Turkey, Yugoslavia, Greece, Spain, and Italy have all established supplementary educational activities for the children. The school officials supply the facilities, the maintenance, and, when special circumstances merit it, the cost of faculty salaries. The countries who host the classes are responsible for the curriculum materials, the salaries of the staff and supplies.

During the 1974-1975 school year, the following numbers of foreign worker students participated in the supplementary classes: 2,200 of 11,380 Turkish students, 510 of 1,600 Yugoslavian students, 101 of 220 Spanish students, and 89 of 550 Italian students. Jancke, in a January 1977 interview, indicated that nearly 100 percent of Greek students participate. He commented that the Greek classes are so successful and so well attended that many of the Greek parents simply let their children skip German classes and attend only the afternoon Greek classes.

By allowing the consulates to provide cultural and language education, the Berlin schools themselves have had to make few

if any curriculum modifications in the regular German language classes, although nearly 180 foreign teachers have been hired by the school administration to teach the transition classes (cf. Rasch, 1976). Once the children leave transition classes, however, further information, instruction, or reinforcement of interest in the mother country comes from outside the purview of the public schools.

Changes in the policy of consulate-sponsored classes have been discussed, but actual modifications have been few and far between. What has generated the most concern is that the teachers, curriculum and pedagogical approaches used in consulate classes are outside the authority of the Berlin school officials. Fears have been expressed that countries which have different ideological views from that of the Federal Republic will send consulate teachers to promulgate that ideology (cf. Wilhelmi, 1976). Jancke (1976a:330) has responded by stating that while there have been "sporadic instances" of ideological and nationalistic material in the classes, there are many more teachers in these same programs of whom such accusations could not be made and who are serving an important function for the children concerned.

Early School Leavers

While the Berlin school program aims at the integration of guestworkers children into "German schools and German life" (Jancke, 1976a:332), in reality many guestworker students do not stay with the schools long enough for such socialization to occur. Köhler's (1976) data indicate that foreign worker children are leaving school at high rates without completing their studies

(see Table below.) His analysis is limited to the vocational track of secondary school [Hauptschule], which 68 percent of all immigrant students in the secondary grades attend.

TABLE 2 HERE

Of the 798 guestworker students in the vocational track who left school during the 1974-1975 academic year, a full 70 percent (N=575) left without a final certificate, only compared with 26 percent of German students who left. Of the approximately 3,200 guestworker students throughout Berlin in the vocational secondary track, one-fifth left school that year with no credentials. Assuming that a comparable percentage of guestworker students leave school each year without completing a certificate, then between 60 and 80 percent who first enter in this track leave with no certification. The chief administrative officer of the Berlin schools has himself confirmed publically the 60 percent estimate (Rasch, 1976).

From these data, two important questions emerge: what are the long term implications of such high rates of dropping out of school and what response is being made by the Berlin schools? The answer to the first can be given succinctly. Without secondary school certification, the foreign worker youth are relegated to low status occupations. The uncredentialed have only the option of taking jobs ignored by others who have stronger academic accomplishments. Uncertified, with no hope of improving their positions, this generation of foreign worker youth is frequently referred to as the "lost generation" (cf. Deutcher Caritasverband,

TABLE 37

School Leavers Among German and Foreign Pupils, 1974/1975, in Berlin (West)

Secondary Vocational Schools

Status and Grade at School Exit	Total	in %	German	in %	Foreign	in %
7th Grade-no Certificate	607	8.5	413	6.5	194	24.7
8th Grade-no Certificate	996	13.9	781	12.3	215	27.2
9th Grade-no Certificate	615	8.6	449	7.0	166	21.0
9th Grade-with Certificate	2,184	30.5	2,055	32.2	129	16.3
10th Grade-with Certificate	2,215	30.9	2,135	33.5	80	10.1
10th Grade-with Certificate for post-secondary study	546	7.6	541	8.5	5	0.6
TOTALS	7,163	100.0	6,347	100.0	789	100.0

Source: Kohler, 1976:92.

1975; Kinnigkeit, 1977; and Wilhelmi, 1976). Lack of certification, moreover, precludes mobility for them (cf. Wilpert, 1974, 1976). The creation of barriers to social mobility among the youth of the second generation makes for, in the words of Bodenbender, a "social time bomb."[9]

Berlin schools have reacted with both a short term and a long term programatic response. The immediate effort has been to intensify German language instruction at the secondary level. But as school officials themselves admit, such efforts are at best able to only slightly reduce the numbers of students leaving without certification (Rasch, 1976). The officials are instead hoping for long-range change, namely that as more of the foreign worker children who come into the schools are Berlin-born and must begin their schooling in standard German language classes, they will gain mastery of the language and be able to complete their studies successfully.

It may be a moot question whether the schools can do much at present to significantly reduce the numbers of early school leavers. Particularly for those students who had come to Berlin after they had already begun (and perhaps finished) compulsory schooling in their home countries, the requirement of attending a German school has been given only the most minimal compliance. Further, the fact that employment has been available, menial as

---

[9] It should be noted here that being born in Germany does not automatically carry citizenship rights. A child must have at least one parent who is a German citizen to qualify for citizenship. Indeed, citizenship is granted only rarely. A ten-year residency is required but even that is not of itself sufficient. Guestworker children who are born and grow up in Germany are excluded from all the rights, protections, and privileges of citizenship. Jancke accurately calls them "wanderers between two worlds."

it may be, means that for the first time in the lives of many of these youth, they have the opportunity to earn a wage.

Jancke (1976a:331) expresses the view that the effectiveness of the schools is limited and that an improvement in the situation lies with the third generation which was born and will grow up in Germany, experiencing a bicultural environment. He states, "At home they will be speaking in the mother-tongue, but outside the home, they are exposed to the German language, to the German society, and to the German way of living."

Jancke's position, of course, is wrought with suppositions. Not only does he take an incremental view of social change with respect to the conditions of the guestworkers, but he also assumes that as such change occurs, German society will be receptive to it. It is still an open question as to how the second and succeeding generations will be received. While the Berlin schools are seeking their educational integration, numerous economic, political, and cultural forces may negate all that the schools seek to achieve. Further, it appears to be a risky policy decision to assume the second generation is indeed "lost," and that an upswing in the conditions of the guestworker communities will come only with the third generation. To wait for social improvements to come in the third generation is to choose a policy of inaction.

The Berlin Approach: A Critique

A critique of the Berlin approach may be made from first, the philosophy of the program and second, the policies initiated

to operationalize the basic assumptions of how guestworker education should proceed. Both levels allow assessment of their impact upon actual programs.

Philosophy: The "integrationist" approach that underlies the educational program in Berlin for the guestworker children is, without doubt, both more realistic and humane than is the "rotation" principle of Bavaria. It acknowledges the fact that the guestworkers and their children are staying in the Federal Republic and that the children being born in these families are also likely to stay, and it seeks to bring the workers and their families into the life of the society rather than to exclude them. There are, however, fundamental propositions in the Berlin approach that still need to be analyzed.

First is the proposition that the integrationist approach can successfully proceed, all the while ignoring and, in some instances, actively suppressing the cultural background of the guestworker children. Rather than building on the diversity and heterogeneity of cultures and experiences of the children, the schools are approaching the integrationist perspective solely from an assimilationist point of view (cf. Rist, 1977, 1978). It is as though the only way that integration can occur is for the children to give up what they are and assume the characteristics of the dominant culture.

It is possible, however, for integration to proceed based on the affirmation of diversity and pluralism. Yet Germany has yet to recognize or legitimate itself as a culturally pluralistic society. Until that recognition comes about, it is unrealistic

to assume the schools would do other than reflect the basic values and cultural perspectives of the larger society.

In the meantime, the guestworker children must experience an educational system that is caught in its own cultural assumptions. By denying legitimacy to the cultural and linguistic background of the children, the schools are ignoring an important pedagogical tool upon which to build the education of the children. As Wilke (1975:364) has noted:

> Migrants' children should be assured of a good knowledge of their mother tongue and indigenous culture, for the mother tongue is one of the foundations of their development and is likely to facilitate the learning of other languages.

Such an approach would also legitimate and establish linkages between the school and the home environment of the guestworker child. John Dewey, as early as 1915, clearly articulated the proposition that continuity was preferable over discontinuity, and that if the schools wished for reinforcement by the families, there had to be viable linkages between the two (Dewey and Dewey, 1915)

What the Berlin approach seeks is to sever the tie between home and school and provide only German language, German curriculum, and German perspectives. In so doing, the schools are creating conditions for the failure of countless foreign worker children. While the German children have that continuity between home and school, and their families are able to reinforce it daily, the foreign worker students are left with no means of finding support, either inside or outside the school.

The need for linkages between schools and foreign worker families certainly would not necessitate that the Berlin schools establish full bicultural and bilingual maintenance programs. To do so is neither feasible nor even necessarily desirable. It is open to question whether the Berlin schools should or even could actively seek to sustain the equal status of the mother-country culture with that of German culture (cf. Epstein, 1977). However, it is both possible and desirable to plan curriculum and instruction so that the backgrounds of the children are not ignored and so that parents need not fear that the schools are actively trying to destroy their own values and set their children against them.[10]

Concerns such as these may move many foreign worker parents to send their children to the "national classes" sponsored by the various consulates and to keep them away from the German public schools. Such a decision by the parents should not be construed as being hostile to Germany, nor need it suggest parents assume they and the children will be returning to the homeland, but rather that the parents do not believe that their children will benefit by the loss of their cultural heritage.

A second of the philosophical underpinnings to the Berlin approach assumes that the schools will preserve German characteristics. Integration in the Berlin schools has so far been a one-way street. While it is reasonable and justifiable to assume that the new immigrants would have to make adjustments in their move to Berlin,

[10]It was precisely such an approach in American schools that led immigrants to establish an extensive private and parochial school system (cf. Ravitch, 1973). Even now, one of every ten children in elementary and secondary schools in the United States is in private or parochial schools (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1977:74).

it does not seem justifiable that the Berlin schools can proceed with no mutual adjustments. With one-sixth of the city school population now foreign worker children and with estimates that by the mid 1980's one of every three school children will be from this group, the schools can hardly refuse to take this constituency into account.

The schools have made only peripheral accomodations to the foreign worker children. The basic structure, philosophy, and methodology of the Berlin schools has remained intact and unchanged. That the schools can remain unchanged amidst this dramatic change in their constituency must be traced to the historical legacy and current power of the institutional members. The essential structure of German education survived the Nazi period, survived the efforts at reform instigated by the Allies in the post-war period, survived the efforts at change from the protest movements of the 1960's, and is not now about to budge on account of foreign children.

The authority and power of the current institutional staff of the schools also ensures that change will not occur. These staff, the vast majority of whom are tenured civil servants ("Beamte"), can successfully resist pressures to accomodate to or understand their foreign worker students. The philosophical view is essentially one of the sanctity of the educational system. It is the individual who must make him-herself worthy of entrance, even if it means that less than 400 foreign worker students ever join the 38,000+ German students in the Berlin Gymnasium system.

Nowhere in the current discussions about the educational future of the foreign worker children does the concept of "affirmative action" arise.[11] The schools are willing to acknowledge their complicity in the creation of lost generations, of a tracking system that relegates the foreign worker children to the lowest occupational categories, and of the total absence of legitimation of the cultural heritage of their homeland. Yet, having acknowledged this, the schools have indicated they are simply willing to wait and hope for improvements in the situation as yet another generation of students goes through the system. The schools do not see it as their role to take an active and interventionist role in promoting social justice and mobility among the children in the foreign worker communities.

Policy: Three significant policies grow out of the above-stated philosophical views. The first is foreign language instruction. Whereas all German children begin to learn a foreign language at the fourth or fifth grade level, the foreign worker children have been excused from this additional language instruction. During the class periods when German students are receiving

---

[11] A recent and articulate defense of the concept of "affirmative action" has come from the United States Commission on Civil Rights (1977). The Commission notes (1977:12):

> The justification for affirmative action to secure equal access to the job market lies in the need to overcome the effects of past discrimination by the employers, unions, colleges, and universities who are asked to undertake such action. It also rests in the practical need to assure that young people whose lives have been marred by discrimination in public education and other institutions are not forever barred from the opportunity to realize their potential and to become useful and productive citizens. The test of affirmative action programs is whether they are well calculated to achieve these objectives and whether or not they do so in a way that deals fairly with the rights and interests of all citizens.

instruction in English, French, or perhaps Latin, the foreign students receive additional German language lessons. At present, when these same students advance to the secondary grades, they are again excused from compulsory foreign language instruction, though it is open to them if they wish.

In the Berlin school system, students who want an academic certificate at the end of secondary school receive instruction in three languages: German and two foreign languages. Thus, a foreign worker student who completes the academic track of secondary school (which, incidentally, extremely few ever do), is likely to have had exposure to four languages, the three of the school and the mother tongue. Rasch (1976) has suggested that one of the two non-German foreign language requirements be suspended for guestworker students if they can demonstrate proficiency in their mother tongue. This suggestion stands as the sole instance of possible legitimation of mother tongue proficiency for the foreign worker students.

Most recently, school officials have proposed to make foreign language instruction compulsory for all guestworker children who begin their schooling in an integrated classroom (cf. Rasch, 1976). The rationale is that by the time the immigrant children are at the age and grade level when foreign language instruction is to begin, they will have had sufficient experience and competence with German to be on a linguistic par with their German peers. It is also proposed that foreign language instruction be included as a mandatory component in the special classes in the over-crowded areas of the city where entire classrooms are composed

of guestworker children. Heretofore, at the time when the German students were beginning foreign language instruction, the guestworker students in these special classes were provided with additional German language instruction, though they were already in a German language classroom.

It is a sensitive and appropriate move on the part of the school officials to be concerned with not overwhelming the foreign worker children with language instruction. If all the school language requirements for these children were followed explicity, the majority of their school hours would be consumed in the study of languages. However, setting a new policy of foreign language requirements actually creates a new set of problems. The bind in having created exceptions for the foreign worker students is that they are thereby denied the opportunity for pursuing any form of post-secondary education. It is a basic requirement of the German school system that if students wish to undertake post secondary studies, they must have received the appropriate certification from the secondary school, and that certification is only awarded when the requirement of two foreign languages has met.

While it can be argued that such restrictions on the educational options of the foreign worker students are irrelevant given that the drop-out rate among these students is approximately two of every three, it is nevertheless of concern. The new policy has institutionalized a pattern of discrimination which denies to the foreign students certain educational options available to German students. Furthermore, it exemplifies the inflexibility of the schools to evolve criteria for assessing competency and successful completion of studies that are not in the classical

pattern of 19th century German education. To exclude such a sizeable percentage of the student population from any possibility of further study not only relegates those students to lower status positions, it unfairly promotes the entrance and advantages of German students. The German students compete only among themselves for the positions in post-secondary education, as public policies ensure that literally thousands of their age mates who come from foreign worker families are excluded.

A second of the policy decisions undergirding the Berlin program that bears scrutiny is one which assumes that a certain "critical mass" of foreign students inhibits the integration of these same students into the German schools. At one level, of course, it is correct to propose that high numbers of foreign students and few native German students will permit opportunities for interaction and learning of German society. Obviously a class composed solely of foreign students would be a hindrance to integration.

But what does need examination is the assumption, unsupported by empirical evidence so far as could be ascertained, that 20 percent was the highest level for foreign student numbers in a classroom before "dis-integrating" forces began to work.[12]

---

[12] It is interesting to compare the Berlin figure of 20 percent as the watershed mark for effective integration with what the research in the United States has suggested. Pettigrew (1974) has suggested a minimum of 20 to 25 percent minority student enrollment in order that these students not feel the isolation and loneliness that would come with fewer of their own group. St. John (1975) suggests anywhere between 14 and 40 percent while Jencks (1975) found academic benefits accruing to minority group students so long as they were more than 10 percent less than 75 percent of the total.

This figure appears to be a purely arbitrary one.[13] The Berlin school officials are to be commended for their concern that the numbers do not grow to such a magnitude that the classes become essentially de facto segregated classes (Kinnigkeit, 1977:3). Yet, exploration is needed of the consequences for the more than 2,000 guestworker children now isolated in segregated "special classes" with only other guestworker children if the percentage allowed in integrated classrooms were to be raised to 25,30 or even 40 percent.

The lack of flexibility on this matter across grade levels, across varying forms of schools, and across the different districts of the city becomes even less justifiable if the 2,000 foreign worker students in the segregated "special classes" are indeed following the same curriculum, and in German, as their German peers. Either these schools are on a par with the integrated schools and there would be no difficulty in moving these students into the integrated classrooms, or they are not. If not, then the result of sustaining "special classes" to keep integration at a minimum level is no different from the Bavarian rationale of creating "model classes." The two approaches, though based upon vastly differing rationales, would thus end up at the same place, i.e., essentially segregated and unequal education.

---

[13] While the choosing of 20 percent may in itself be arbitrary, the decision of the Berlin school officials was without a precedent. The Standing Conference of Ministers of Education and Culture (KMK) stated in their March 8, 1976 paper on guestworker education that "so far as it is possible, the number of guestworker children in standard German classes should not surpass one-fifth."

It is incumbent upon the Berlin school authorities to spell out a clear rationale for the perservation of the 20 percent quota, and to indicate the anticipated impact upon the integration of the 2,000 now segregated students if the quotas were lifted. If the special schools have been successful, there is no justification for maintaining the exclusion of these students from the integrated classrooms. To perpetuate the special schools in their present form is simply to preserve segregated education.

A third policy of the Berlin school is the stance the schools have taken on early childhood education. There exist in Berlin no special programs for the pre-school guestworker children. What makes this program omission of particular importance is that it calls into question a key assumption held by the school authorities on the ability of the foreign worker children to function from the beginning of their school careers with German as the language of instruction. Jancke and Rasch have publicly expressed their opinion that guestworker children born in Berlin will have had sufficient exposure to German by the time they are ready to begin school that they can successfully function in German language classrooms.

As noted earlier the view of school officials is that guestworker children are being raised in a bicultural setting--the home reinforcing the culture of the mother country and the larger society reinforcing German culture. What the schools assume is that the secondary socialization of the children by the larger society (in contrast to the primary socialization of the family) is sufficient to permit them to function in German classes. This proposition is open to serious question.

No evidence could be located which sustains the view that the language acquisition of the children has been of such a magnitude that they were ready for German language instruction.[14] Furthermore, the guestworkers live in rather concentrated communities. During the early years of their lives, the children are thus more likely to function in their ethnic community and consequently, only in their mother tongue--and more so if the parents speak to the children in the mother tongue. The child who enters a classroom on the first day of school where all instruction is in German has been programmed to fail. To be in German society but not of it does not seem to be a sufficient condition upon which to assume the children are equipped to perform in German classes.

The preschool program could fill a vital need as a transition period for the children from the language and milieu of the home to the language and expectations of the German classroom (cf. Arbeitsgruppe Tagesmütter, 1977:188-202). As it is now, the preschool program functions in the same manner as do the schools: German is the language of instruction and no alternatives or modifications are allowed.

To create such a preschool program would also be beneficial in providing contacts and means of sharing information with the parents. The present assumption is apparently that the medium of communication between school and home will be German, and if

---

[14] I could not locate evidence which indicated that the school officials had data on the actual language proficiency of the foreign worker children when they first entered school. The fact that the Berlin schools have begun, since 1976, to sponsor a professorship on guestworker education at the technical university may be a step toward more systematic evaluation than is presently available.

the parents are not able to so communicate, then it will be up to the children to provide the bridge for communication, a tenuous link at best when the children themselves are in the process of learning German.

Current statistics on the attendance patterns of both German and guestworker preschool children show that approximately 90 percent of all German children are in a preschool program while the comparable figure for guestworker children is 30 percent (Jancke, 1976b;97). While neither preschool nor kindergarten is compulsory in Berlin, it would be of interest to speculate what impact a program more attuned to the needs of guestworker children might have on their later school careers. It would be an important contribution if the children had the opportunity to interact with adults speaking to them in German, to work with the German language curriculum materials, to learn correct pronunciation, and to gain at least a minimal facility in the language.

On the Will to Integrate

The philosophical and policy approaches of the Berlin schools towards the education of the guestworker children suggest that school integration can occur with little guidance or forethought. The syllogism is essentially based on the assumption that children born in Berlin can function in Berlin schools. Therefore, since increasing numbers of guestworker children are born in Berlin, they can successfully function in the schools. As has been emphasized, this logic is open to serious questioning, especially in the light that school officials have presented no data to substantiate these contentions.

Furthermore, the schools are working from a very narrow perception of what can constitute "integration." By limiting the percentage of any classroom to no more than 20 percent guest-worker children, the schools assume that a larger number would diminish the potential for interaction and integration into German society. This assumption, too, is open to question, especially since the consequence is that more than 2,000 children are being segregated in "special classes" so as to preserve the 20 percent level in other classes. The maintenance of these classes is a far worse option than integrating these children into regular German classrooms. These special classes should be abolished as quickly as possible. One wonders if school officials are more concerned with the integration of the guest-worker children or the preservation of German student hegemony. In Berlin, where the percentages of guestworker elementary school pupils range from three percent in one district to nearly forty percent in another, no German child under the present policy is in a classroom where Germans are less than an 80 percent majority.

To achieve a viable integrate educational program for the guestworker children, the Berlin schools must actively pursue those means which enhance contact and interaction among guestworker and German children. Further, the schools need to support those programs which allow children to bridge the culture of home with that of the schools. Most specifically, the schools should facilitate language transition programs rather than simply assume that being in Germany is sufficient to learn German.

An effective integration program in Berlin, one that will not only carry the children through the schools, but into those

aspects of German society and culture that they desire to explore, must be a program that does not force children to deny their past. To legitimate the cultural heritages of the guestworker children is also to acknowledge the legitimacy of their present bicultural identity. The schools have instead thought integration was a one-way process of the guestworker children being assimilated into the German language and forms of education. What the schools have sought is not social and cultural integration, but rather accommodation and acquiescence.

To have it otherwise, the schools will have to change their relationship to the guestworker communities. They will have to reach out actively into these communities and convince the parents that the schools are indeed sensitive to the backgrounds and experiences of the children. They will also have to make it explicit that they reject the role of being exclusively a "Germanizing" agent and will not seek to strip the students of their ethnic and cultural backgrounds (as if they really could). The schools will also have to think about new programs and new ways of providing instruction and learning experiences for the guestworker children Of special concern should be initiating early childhood education, providing after-school assistance, working with parents and perhaps providing them language instruction as well, and revamping the content of curricular materials to reflect the diversities of history and geography present in the guestworker communities.

The fact that the Berlin schools have publicly committed themselves to a program fostering the integration of the guestworker children into the schools is an admirable goal. It is surely

preferable to assuming the children should be educated for eventual schooling in Turkey or Yugoslavia. But if the Berlin pronouncements are to be no more than mere public relations, the schools are going to have to go an extra mile. They will also have to change in structure as well as in content, for there is no way one can realistically forsee the integration of the guestworker children into the schools so long as the present arrangements persist. It is unjust for the schools to espouse equal educational opportunity, all the while perpetuating policies and programs which enhance segregation and failure. In a very real way, the future of Berlin itself will depend not on words, but on deeds.

Postscript:

This present paper has sought to sketch in broad outlines the nature of the educational system in two German Länder--Bavaria and Berlin--as they impact upon the lives of the children of the guestworkers. As is immediately apparent, the pedagogical orientations, the ideological justifications, and the political overtones to the education of guestworker children within these two Länder are quite dissimilar. While the Bavarian model is based on the assumption that the foreign workers come into and then out of Germany on a continual rotation, the Berlin model strives for the full integration of the foreign children. And while these are admittedly generalizations, it is clear from the intent of the educational programs developed in these Länder that the Bavarian model stresses the transiency and impermanence of the foreign communities within Germany while the Berlin approach is aimed at their assimilation and eventual absorption into German society.

Both approaches can be challenged as to their domain assumptions and subsequent educational practices. Neither acknowledges the legitimacy of the emerging multi-cultural nature of German society. Both fail to respond to the fact that there are now countless thousands of foreign worker families that are daily learning more of Germany and how to accomodate themselves to the country on a long term basis, yet not discarding the cultural heritage and integrity that they have brought with them. At present there is a profound disjuncture between the home as the primary agent of socialization and the school.

While Bavaria assumes the guestworkers and their families will never truly become "German," the Berlin approach does not allow for the "Turkish," or "Greek," or "Yugoslav" side to be sustained and supported. The end result is that neither program nurtures the educational needs of children who are, in fact, growing up as "Turkish-Germans," or "Greek-Germans," or "Yugoslav-Germans." The policies and programs in each of these two Länder works in their own way to negate one side of the hyphen and thus work against what are in fact the beginnings of an ethnically pluralistic society. The end result is that the educational assumptions of both approaches reinforce incorrect perceptions of the social reality in which guestworker children themselves live and grow.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akpinar, U., Lopez-Blasco, A., and J. Vink
1977. Pädagogische Arbeit mit ausländischen Kinder und Jugendlichen. Munich: Juventa Verlag.

Arbeitsgruppe Tagesmütter
1977. Das Modellprojekt Tagesmütter. Munich: Juventa Verlag.

Bavarian Ministry for Instruction and Culture

1974. "Die Brücken zür Heimat nicht abbrechen--Das 'Offene modell' Bayerns," Schul Report. No. 2, pp. 20-21.

1975. "Das Kultusministerium weist Angriffe auf das bayerische Modell zur schulischen Betreuung der Kinder ausländischer Arbeitnehmer züruck," Pressereferat. p. 5.

1977. Unterricht für Kinder ausländischer Arbeitnehmer. p. 5.

Berlin Senator für Schulwesen

1971. Ausführungsvorschriften über den Unterricht für Kinder ausländischer Arbeitnehmer und für jugendliche ausländishe Arbeitnehmer. Berlin: Senator für Schulwesen.

1976. Das Schuljahr 1976/1977 in Zahlen. Berlin: Senator für Schulwesen.

Bodenbender, W.
1976. "Zwischenbilanz der Ausländerpolitik," presented to the Conference on Bildungsprobleme und Zukunftserwartungen der Kinder Türkischer Gastarbeiter. Munich: Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft.

Conference of Ministers of Culture and Education, Federal Republic of Germany
1976. Unterricht für Kinder ausländischer Arbeitnehmer. Bonn: KMK.

Council of Europe

1974a. Ad Hoc Conference on the Education of Migrants. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Documentation Centre for Education in Europe.

1974b. Record of the Proceeding of the Ad Hoc Conference on the Education of Migrants. Strasbourg: Documentation Centre for Education in Furope.

Deutscher Caritasverband
1975. Die verlorene Generation? Frieberg: Deutscher Caritasverband.

Dewey, J. and Dewey, E.
1915. Schools of Tomorrow. New York: E.P. Dutton Co.

Diamant, M.
1970. "Bemerkunger zur sozialen and rechtlinchen Lage der ausländischen Arbeitnehmer," Auslaandergesetz '65, Alternativentwurf '70. Bonn: Neue Gesellschaft.

Epstein, N.
1977. Language, Ethnicity and the Schools. Washington D.C.: George Washington University Institute for Educational Leadership.

European Economic Community
1976. "Revised Draft Directive on the Education of Migrant Workers' Children," Brussels: EEC (mimeograph).

Federal Labor Office, Federal Republic of Germany
1976. Federal Labor Statistics. Nürnberg: Federal Labor Office.

Federal Ministry for Education and Science, Federal Republic of Germany
1976. Grund - und Struktur Daten. Bonn: BMBW.

Federal Ministry for Labor and Social Affairs, Federal Republic of Germany
1976. "Report to the Organization for Economic and Co-Operation and Development," p. 26.

Ferber, B. and Mueller, H.
1977. "Probleme einer gemeinsamen Erziehung deutscher und ausländischer Vorschulkinder--Ergebnisse und Interpertation einer Befrangung in Kreuzberger Kindertagesstatten." Bonn: Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Katholischen Studenten - und Hochschulgemeinden.

Frankfurter Rundschau
1975. "Fine verlorene Gerneration ausländishcher Kinder?" (October 4, 1975).

Friberg, D. and Hohmann, M.
1976. "Die schulische Situation ausländisher Kinder Schulpflict und Schulrect," in M. Hohmann, (ed.), Unterricht mit ausländischen Kinder. Düsseldorf: Schwann. pp. 11-25.

Harant, S.
1976. "Schulprobleme von Gastarbeiterkinder," in H. Reimann and H. Riemann, eds., Gastarbeiter. Munich: William Goldmann. pp. 149-168.

Jancke, E.

1976a. "Zur Schulsituation der Kinder ausländischer Arbeitnehmer in Berlin," Neue Unterrichts Praxis. Vol. 9, No. 6, pp. 324-333.

1976b. "Zur Schulischen Situation der Kinder ausländischer Arbeitnehmer in Berlin," Forum. No. 4, pp. 94-99.

Jencks, C.S. and Brown, M.
1975. "The Effects of Desegregation on Student Achievement: Some New Evidence from the Equality of Educational Opportunity Survey," Sociology of Education. Vol. 48.

Kinnigkeit, W.
1977. "Kruezbergs Zweisprachige Analphabenten," Süddeutsche Zeitung. April 19, p. 3.

Köhler, H.
1976. Daten zur Situation der Haupschulen in Berlin (West). Berlin: Max Planck Institut für Bildungsforschung.

Mahler, G.
1974. "Das bayerische Schulmodell in der Diskussion," Die Inner Mission. pp. 473-481.

1976a. Zweitsprache Deutsch. Donauwörth: Auer.

1976b. "Das bayerische Modell--Vorbild einer Ländereinheitlichen Regelung," Schul Report. No. 4.

Minzlaff, G.
1976. "Weg in die Isolation? Zur Schulsituation von Kinder ausländischer Arbeitnehmer," Forum Europa. Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 21-25.

Müller, H.
1975. Ausländische Arbeiter in unserer Gesellschaft. Munich: Kösel.

National Center for Educational Statistics/DHEW
1977. The Condition of Education, 1977. vol. 3. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
1976. SOPEMI Continuous Reporting System on Migration. Paris: OECD.

Pettigrew, T.
1974. "A Sociological View of the Post Milliken Era," Presented to the United States Commission on Civil Rights in hearings, Washington, D.C.

Rasch, W.
1976. "Ausländischer Schüler in Berlin," Frankfurter Randschau. April 11, p. 13.

Ravitch, D.
1973. The Great School Wars: New York City, 1805-1973. New York: Basic Books.

Rist, R.C.

1972. The Quest for Autonomy: A Socio-Historical Study of Black Revolt in Detroit. Afro-American Studies Center. University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

1978. The Invisible Children: School Integration in American Society. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

1978 (forthcoming). Guestworkers in Germany: The Prospects for Pluralism. New York: Praeger/Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

St. John, N.
1975. School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children. New York: Wiley-Interscience.

United States Commission on Civil Rights
1977. Statement on Affirmative Action. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

United States Department of State
1976. 1975 Annual Labor Report. United States Embassy, Bonn.

Wilhemi, J.
1976. "Analphabeten in zwie Sprachen," Frankfurter Rundschau. April 10, p. 10.

Wilpert, C.
1974. "The Socialization of the Children of Migrant Labourers," paper presented to the International Conference on Migrant Workers. Berlin: International Institute of Management.

1976. "Zukunftserwartungen der Kinder Türkischer Arbeitnehmer," paper presented to conference on Bildungsprobleme und Zukunftserwartungen der Kinder Türkischer Gastarbeiter, Munich: Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft.

Willke, I.
1975. "Schooling of Immigrant Children in West-Germany, Sweden, England," International Review of Education. Vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 357-382.